MODERN REVISIONISTS – THE GREATEST LIQUIDATORS IN THE HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

TIRANA, 1965

MODERN REVISIONISTS — THE GREATEST LIQUIDATORS IN THE HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

(Article published in the «Party's Way» review, theoretic and political organ of the Central Committee of the Party of Labor of Albania, Nr. 6, 1965)

THE «NAIM FRASHËRI» PUBLISHING HOUSE.
TIRANA, 1965

The Party of Labor of Albania together with other fraternal marxist-leninist parties. has more than once called attention to the attempts of the modern revisionists to degenerate the communist parties into social-democratic ones and has pointed out that this inevitably leads, sooner or later, to their organizational break up, to their complete fusion with social-democratic parties.

Every passing day is bringing out new facts that confirm the correctness and complete justification of this warning of the fraternal marxist-leninist parties. Every one who does not intentionally blindfold his eyes can see that these liquidating attempts of the modern revisionists are becoming more persistent, more concrete and are assuming an increasingly open form. This is more clearly seen during the debates since November 1964 in the columns of the Italian Communist Party press regarding the creation of the so-called «single party of the working class». A similar debate on the problem of relations between socialists and communists was entered into also by the international revisionist review «Problems of Peace and Socialism» in its first two issues of the current year. The present Soviet leaders have also taken part in both these discussions and have contributed a lot of material to their own press on the same subject.

As usual during these recent years since the

20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the Italian Togliatist revisionists showed themselves this time too more eager to carry things to their logical end. By their «sincerity» they revealed what the other revisionists like the Khrushchevites and those who follow their line and tactics only thought but did not dare to state in public, they thus laid bare the real liquidating intentions and objectives of all modern revisionists.

This time the banner was seized by G. Amendola (member of the leadership and of the secretariat of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, who seems to represent the extreme right wing in the ranks of the revisionist leadership of the Italian Communist Party, in which, following the death of P. Togliatti, there are three trends: the right wing, the center and the «left wing»). Amendola's so-called «hypotheses» have aroused a «fiery» discussion among revisionists: there were persons who gave them full support and there were others who allegedly opposed them, who called Amendola's suggestions and ideas as «hasty ones», and maintained a «critical» stand towards them (to wit: L. Longo, R. Leda and others). The present Soviet leaders took sides with the latter.

The discussions in question bring out at least two main points:

On one hand, they show that the modern revisionists have one point of *strategy in common — the way of liquidating the revolutionary parties of the working class, of turning them parties of social revolution to parties of social reform, to «bourgeois labor parties», the way to uniting and fusing them with social-democratic parties from the organizational point of view also.*

But on the other hand, the discussions showed that there exist *tactical* divergences among revisionist groups regarding the rythms, forms and methods to be adopted in this common treacherous way to attain the liquidating ends of the revisionists.

The matter under discussion is of vital significance to the entire international communist movement. Marxist-leninists, for whom the cause of the revolution and of socialism is dear, cannot stand aloof as neutral onlookers before the attempt of the modern revisionists to break up and do away with the communists and workers parties, to disarm and disorganize the working class, to deprive it of a revolutionary leading staff before an organized bourgeoisie armed to the teeth. The struggle of marxist-leninists to expose the treacherous acts of the revisionists, to frustrate their liquidating objectives in order to rescue the communist and workers parties from social-democratic degeneration and decay, assumes paramount importance at present. It is essential to expose before all communists and workers and to crush not only the open, extremist liquidating acts of Amendola and his companions but also the more wily, the more covert, the more refined and more dangerous acts of those who, formally or for tactical reasons, feign to oppose Amendola, but in reality and in essence stand on the same disruptive positions with him and preach the same line of treason as he.

— I —

G. Amendola has expressed his views on the «single party» in a series of articles appearing in the review «Rinascita» in the November to December

1964 issues, especially in the article under the heading «Hypotheses on Unification» («Rinascita» dated November 28, 1964).

Amendola's views can be briefly summed up in this manner: a) he condemns unconditionally the split among communists and socialists in the ranks of the working movement and proposes the creation of a «single party» of the working class, considering this as a very actual and urgent matter; b) he considers the setting up of a «single party» as entirely essential to working out and putting into effect a «new Italian way to socialism», because during the last fifty years neither the social-democratic nor the communist lines have led to socialism in Italy or in other capitalist countries; c) the proposed «single party» will neither be a communist nor a social-democratic party, but quite a new party without «ideological obstacles», open to communists, socialists and different democrats, it will not be a «narrow party of cadres» but a «wide party of the masses».

Let us dwell at length on these matters:

G. Amendola condemns the disunion with the renegates of marxism and of communism and preaches union and fusion with them

In order to justify his thesis on the indispensability of attaining unity between socialists and communists and the setting up of the so called «single party of the working class» G. Amendola makes an excursion into history and traces out with dramatic colors «the great evil» arising from the split between communists and social democrats. «Today, after fifty years» he writes in his article on «Socialism in

the West», «we can assess the consequences of the failure of the II International: the split that aroused as a consequence of the war and which was deepened by the October Revolution, the break between the social-democrats and communists, the failure of social-democracy which never went further than managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie..... and the inability of the communists to achieve the unity of the working class under their leadership. This situation cost the West fifty years of painful experiments, gave rise to fascism, to wars, the movement for emancipation from colonialism remained helpless, the working movement in the west lagged behind in contrast to the forward march that took place in the world of socialism and the national-liberation movement.... The split in the working movement of the capitalist countries did not enable the latter to render an original contribution to the world struggle for socialism, a contribution that would confirm by facts the necessary relation between socialism and freedom, that would utilize the glorious heritage accumulated in the major democratic battles of the years 800 and 900 as well as the cultural heritage of the major currents of modern thought».

Thus, Amendola, inspite of his high pretenses of «deep meditation and studies», of his «critical scrutiny and creative stand», departs from the most elementary principle of dialectics which envisages the concrete investigation of every concrete situation, passes by in silence the reasons and circumstances under which the split occurred, who originated it and the possibility of avoiding it, denounces the split a priori as something evil, and without drawing any distinction, preaches the necessity of unity under all circumstances and at all costs. Such an

abstract treatment of the problem on the part of G. Amendola aims at falsifying history and at putting it to the service of the present liquidating theses.

Of course, the question of the unity of the working class is a major one of vital importance to the advancement of its revolutionary movement. But in matters of unity and dissension one must always maintain a dialectic attitude: the cause and originators of the split must be considered in every case and in every case one should see whether unity or the split serve the cause of the proletariat and of socialism. For unity is not always, with any one and under every circumstance, useful and acceptable for revolutionary marxist-leninists, just as the split does not always serve the cause of the working class.

It is publicly known that the reason for the split lies in the treachery of the II International, which, during the period of the first imperialist war, plunged into the positions of social-chauvinism, joined with the bourgeoisie and promoted their imperialist designs, whereas after the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution crossed over to anti-communist positions and became the sworn enemy of the Soviet Union.

The evils and great misfortunes which befell the West during these last fifty years and to which Amendola refers with such «passion» have come to it exactly from this treachery of social-democracy. But Amendola neglects this indisputable fact altogether and, instead of denouncing treason and the traitors, condemns only the split as such. He attributes all the blame for these evils and misfortunes to the split in general, to the break of the com-

munists with the social-democrats and makes no mention of the real originators of this split — the betrayal of social-democracy. This is the same as to condemn without discrimination the war as a disastrous evil that causes suffering, distruction and countless victims and to fail to expose and denounce its cause and true originators — imperialism and the imperialists.

On the other hand, Amendola's description of the history of the workers movement in Western Europe in such tragic colors is an attempt at belittling and discrediting this movement, at denying its major achievements. Inspite of the inevitable split brought about by the betrayal of social democracy and in battle with this split and these splitters, the revolutionary movement of workers grew and developed, marxist-leninist communist parties sprang up and grew stronger, a new unity on a new basis was achieved that led to fresh victories for marxism-leninism and socialism. Contrary to G. Amendola's trumped up charges and attacks the European communist and workers movement has written glorious pages in its revolutionary history and has rendered a major contribution to the development of the world revolutionary process.

By cursing and denouncing the split alone and all its evils and by taking traitors and splitters under his protection G. Amendola is in fact rising against the communists who followed the line of severring connections with splitters and fighting against dissension. He denounces this line as a fatal one which brought about all these evils and misfortunes to the West. But what would have happened if the communists had followed at that time Amendola's present suggestions — the line of joining in with

traitors and splitters? The sole result of such a line would have been the complete liquidation of the revolutionary workers and communist movement and the absolute domination of treacherous social-democracy in the workers movement.

It is well known that it is precisely a policy of this kind of unity with opportunists, social-chauvinists and various renegates that K. Kautzky used to pursue at that time. And what was the result of his centrist stand? The inevitable result was that Kautzky himself slipped into positions of opportunism, joined fully with social-chauvinists and became the frantic enemy of Soviet rule and socialism, winning the inglorious fame of renegate and traitor. «What brought about the death of the old social-democracy as a revolutionary party?» J.V. Stalin has written». Among others, also because Kautzky & C° resorted to the «refined» tactics of protecting and rescuing the rightists, the «delicate» tactics of «unity and peace» with Ed. Bernstein & C°. But what came out of this in the end? It turned out that at a critical moment preceding the outbreak of war, the righ-wing social-democrats betrayed the workers, «the orthodox» turned to slaves of the rightists, while social-democracy as a whole became «a liwing corpse» (J.V. Stalin, Works, Albanian edition, vol. 7, pp. 65 & 66).

Contrary to and in battle with the reconciliatory centrist positions of Kautzky & C°, revolutionary marxists, with Lenin at the head, pursued with strict consistence the way of exposing and fighting mercilessly and irreconcilably against the opportunists, the way of drawing a clear line with them, as a necessary condition to carry the revolutionary work of the proletariat ahead with success». No tasks of

the revolution can now be accomplished» Lenin wrote at that time, «no international unity of workers can be achieved without breaking off firmly with opportunism and without making it clear to the masses that it is bound to fail» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 21, page 16). Lenin wrote also: «To explain to the masses the inevitability and indispensability of severring connections with opportunism, to educate them for the revolution with the merciless fight agains opportunism, not to lose sight of the experience of the war (the imperialist war-editors) in order to lay bare all the mean things about the workers national-liberal policy and not to hush them up — this is the only marxist line in the world labor movement» (V.I. Lenin, Against Revisionism, Russian edition, page 307).

Moreover, V.I. Lenin has waged a merciless war in order to expose and smash not only open opportunism but also those who preached reconciliation with the opportunists (Kautzky and all those who pursued a centrist policy), considering these as very dangerous to the cause of the working class. «His (that is Kautzky's-editors) sophistry which covers up the filth of opportunists with very smooth and glossy terms, is very dangerous and base...» Lenin has written in this regard, «Opportunists are an evil that can be seen. The German 'center' with Kautzky at the head is an evil under cover, coated with diplomacy, which blurs the eyes, the mind and conscience of workers, it is a most dangerous thing. Our task now is to fight unconditionally and openly against international opportunism and against those who keep it under cover (Kautzky)» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 35, pp. 120 & 121). Replying to those who wanted him to cease fighting

against opportunists and centrists for the sake of the unity of social democracy, Lenin wrote: «... to fight against Kautzky and the other representatives of the «center» is a socialist duty for me» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition vol. 23, p. 193). In «Conditions of Admittance to the Communist International» drawn up by him, Lenin stressed most vigorously: «No communist should forget the lessons drawn from the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The union of the Hungarian communists with the reformists cost the Hungarian proletariat very dearly» (V.I. Lenin, Against Revisionism, Russian edition, page 498).

These are the historic facts which go to show that because of the betrayal of the II International, the split in the workers movement became inevitable and indispensable. Without a clear cut separation from the opportunists, without a merciless fight against them, there could be no question of a victory of the October Revolution nor of the subsequent major socialist achievements of world historic significance.

Whereas G. Amendola, by condemning unconditionally and without a concrete historical analysis of the split in the workers movement, distorts history and, actually, rises against the line pursued by Lenin and the IIId International on the indispensability of breaking up with the opportunists and the renegates of marxism and socialism, he, in fact, upholds in a silent manner Kautzky's treacherous centrist line. According to his revisionist reasoning it turns out that the splitters seem to have been Lenin and the IIId International who have waged a bitter and relentless struggle to break up with the IInd International and with the opportunists of all countries.

This is clearly seen also in the way he treats the problem in his article on «The united Battle for Socialism» («Rinascita» dated December 12, 1964), in which he writes « . . . . I am of the opinion that a serious critical study of the development of workers movement during these last fifty years would help *eliminate many schemes of the past which stand today in the way of achieving the political unity of the working class»*, (underlining by the editors). To what «schemes of the past» is reference made here? It is clear that G. Amendola has at least partially in mind the stand of revolutionary marxist-leninists, begining from Lenin down, towards social-democracy as a tool of the bourgeoisie in the workers movement, and their line of severring the connections of communists from the social democrats and of exposing the latter.

Therefore, according to Amendola, the fight against treachery and the dissentient acts of social-democracy, which degenerated to an agency of the bourgeoisie in the workers movement, is a scheme of the past which should be given up as soon as possible for the sake of unity and of setting up the unified party of the working class. But how can this be possible when Amendola himself is obliged to admit in his writings that with the failure of the IInd International, social-democracy abandoned the positions of socialism and «did not go beyond managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie», that it even «took part in the bloody suppression of many revolutions» etc? And yet, contrary to the sound logic of facts and at variance even with himself, G. Amendola maintains the view that the present split in the ranks of the working class, between communists, socialists, social-democrats and other «progressive»

forces, is a split «between the many different social trends which forge objectively ahead towards socialist transformation», is the chopping up of the «political representative of the working class».

In order to justify their course of joining in with and merging with social-democracy, the revisionists try to persuade the people that «major changes have allegedly come about in the ranks of social-democracy, that «positive trends» have appeared in it, that the social democrats have effected a «turn to the left», that they are «workers parties» and that they «fight for socialism».

In an article appearing in the April 7, 1964 issue of the «Zëri i Popullit» under the title of «Modern revisionists on the road to social-democratic degeneration and to merging with social-democracy», it has been proved with many facts that it is not the social-democrats but the «communists» degenerated into revisionists that have changed, that it is not at all the social-democratic station which is moving towards the modern revisionist train, as the latter strive to create the illusion, but, on the contrary, it is the revisionist train that is moving at record speed towards the social-democratic station.

It suffices to have a look at even the practical political activity of the present social-democrats alone to be convinced that they continue to stand on the same anti-socialist positions and in the service of the bourgeoisie as heretofore. J.V. Stalin has rightly stressed that «Social-democracy in the land of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a counter-revolutionary force which strives to re-establish capitalism and eliminate the dictatorship of the proletariat in the name of «bourgeois» democracy. In capitalist countries where the rule of the proletariat

does not yet exist, social democracy is either an opposition party to the capitalist rule, or a semi-governmental party allied to the liberal bourgeoisie against the most reactionary forces of capitalism and against the revolutionary workers movement, or a fully government party openly upholding capitalism and bourgeois «democracy» opposing the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. It finally becomes entirely counter-revolutionary and its anti-revolutionary character is directed against the rule of the proletariat only when proletarian rule becomes a reality». (J.V. Stalin, Works, Albanian edition, vol. 10, pp. 204 & 205).

But let us refer to historical facts which confirm in full these exact characteristics of the political profile of social-democracy which J. Stalin has given.

It is publicly known that especially after the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, social-democracy assumed an open hostile attitude towards the Soviets and socialism; it became a frantic enemy of the Soviet Union, in Hungary it betrayed the revolution and led it to the overthrow of the Soviet rule; in Germany it took part in the suppression of the revolution, while later it paved the way, through its opportunist and treacherous policy, for the fascists to come to power and so on and so forth. After the Second World War social democracy has in essence not changed its attitude either. Here are the facts:

In many capitalist countries like in those of Scandinavia, in England, France, Belgium, Austria, Italy, Canada and elsewhere, the social-democrats or laborites have been and are, in many cases, in the government and in some countries, even at the

head of governments. What have they done for socialism? In fact, no step has been taken in these countries towards socialism, and the social-democrats in power have become, as Leon Blum has expressed it, «loyal managers of capitalist society», in other words, lackeys of the bourgeoisie, defenders of their domination, defenders of capitalist exploitation of the broad masses of workers, oppressors of the workers of their own countries and of the peoples of other countries, stranglers of their revolutionary and liberation movements.

In France it was precisely G. Mollet's «socialist» government which incited the barbarous colonialist war in Indochina, which intensified the war against the Algerian people and took severe police measures against other peoples under French domination, which jointly with the English imperialists launched its armed aggression against Egypt.

In Belgium, «socialist» Paul Henri Spaak, former Secretary-General of the imperialist aggressiv bloc of NATO and now Vice-Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs in Belgium, as a lackey of the imperialists, became one of the hangmen of the freedom-loving people of the Congo.

The Chairman of the Socialist Party in West Germany is Willy Brandt, the ill-famed Mayor of West Berlin, a frenzied revenge—seeker and firce enemy of socialism, a fiery partisan of arming the Bundeswehr with nuclear weapons.

Wilson's labor government has been for some time in power in England, and G. Amendola has expressed the hopes that this may become the basis of forming an «European democratic left». And what has happened? It is pursuing the same policy, as the conservatives both externally and internally,

and it has recently even given full support to the American imperialists in their barbarous aggression against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam.

In Italy itself Nenni's and Saragat's «socialist» parties with which G. Amendola proposes to merge the Italian Communist Party, take part in the so-called «government of the left center» and, forming a bloc with the demo-christians, are pursuing a reactionary and anti-popular policy. It is well known that the present Italian government in which these «socialists» take part, joined likewise in with the American imperialists in their aggressive acts against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, jeopardizing world peace.

Nor has the attitude of social-democracy changed in the field of economy either. The Social-democrats have totally given up all the principles and ideals of socialism, they have become open supporters of the capitalist order of exploitation. Their «democratic socialism» has nothing in common with true scientific socialism, it is its negation, its substitution with certain liberal-bourgeois reforms which do not in the least change the basis of capitalist society. The present social-democrats have abandoned the most elementary demands of socialism — the abolishment of private ownership of the means of production. They direct the attention of workers not against capitalism, but only against «unsupervised» capitalism. They repeat openly or in a roundabout way the bourgeois theories in vogue on «people's capitalism» «organized» and «democratic». They uphold the principle of «free, private initiative wherever it is possible» in economic life. And while they deny the socialist character of transformations in socialist countries, they try to deceive the workers

in their countries, by holding out the nationalization of a part of enterprises by the bourgeois state, the setting up of state monopoly capitalism, the intervention of the capitalist state in the economic life and others, as a realization of socialism under conditions of the capitalist order. The social-democrats, whether in opposition, in the government or heading it, have not in the least weakened the economic positions of the bourgeoisie through their policy or practical activity, but have, on the contrary, strengthened them.

Thus, facts go to prove that social-democracy, far from changing its attitude towards fundamental issues, has remained a servant and assistant of the bourgeoisie, their tool in the workers movement, that the social democratic parties are representatives of the working class only in name, whereas in reality they are, as Lenin dubbs them, «bourgeois workers parties». If there are any who have changed their attitude towards fundamental issues, they are not at all the social-democrats but the modern revisionists who have betrayed marxism-leninism and the cause of socialism, who have slipped into the positions of social-democracy, a thing which is very clearly demonstrated both by G. Amendola's views as well as the views of other revisionists. Just as in the days of Lenin so also today in the process of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, a new current of international opportunism has arisen, namely modern revisionism and its inevitable consequence, the fight of marxist-leninists against the revisionists. It is precisely the betrayal of modern revisionists towards marxism-leninism, towards the vital interests of the proletariat and of the laboring masses, towards the cause of socialism

and communism, it is their attempts to degenerate the socialist order and to turn the revolutionary parties of the proletariat into bourgeois reformist parties — it is precisely these that have brought about a split in the present international communist movement. Opportunism and revisionism constitute today as in the past, the ideologic source of the split in the workers and communist movement, while the split itself is the expression of opportunism and revisionism in the organizational field. That is why the fight of marxist-leninists against modern revisionism is a fight against splitters. This battle and a clear-cut line drawn with modern revisionists are today absolutely essential and the primary condition to achieve a sound, marxist-leninist unity in the communist movement, for the struggle in defense of this unity is inseparable from the struggle in defense of the revolutionary principles of marxism-leninism from revisionist distortions, for only by having a sound ideological and political unity based on these principles can the international workers and communist movement have a unity of organized and effective actions against capitalism and for the triumph of communism. Any «unity» with opportunist and revisionist renegates constitutes a serious danger to the cause of the revolution and socialism and hampers the achievement of true marxist-leninist unity, which our movement stands in great need of at present. Very actual sound today great Lenin's words when he stressed with force: «Unity is a great cause and great watchword! But the cause of workers stands in need of the *unity of marxists* and not the unity of marxists with opponents and the distorters of marxism» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 20, page 211).

«The Italian Way to Socialism» is the social-democratic way for perpetuating capitalism

The indispensability of setting up the so called «unified» party of the working class» is drawn, by G. Amendola, out of the need to search for and elaborate an «entirely new» way to promote socialism in Italy, which would even serve as a pattern for other advanced capitalist countries. This is how Amendola poses the question:

He writes «..... the need for a single party for the Italian working class arises from the following critical analysis: Neither of the two solutions presented to the working class of the capitalist countries of Western Europe — neither the social-democratic nor the communist solutions — showed itself capable of realizing the socialist transformation of society and the change of system. If we do not proceed from an acceptance of this kind, critical and selfcritical at the same time, we cannot grasp the need for a radical change which would remove the causes that, for fifty years, have hindered the workers movement of the advanced capitalist countries to render their decisive contribution to the progress of socialism in the world.... A political organization which does not achieve its definite objectives during half a century, with at least three generations of militants, must look for the reasons of this failure and transform itself» (G. Amendola, «Hypotheses on re-unification», «Rinascita» Nov. 28, 1964). And further: «Let us go in search of this original new way to socialism together in a new party, in a single party of the Italian working class — this is what we propose to socialist comrades of diverse trends and organizations....» (idem)

As to G. Amendola's «very deep» insight to the fact that «the social-democratic solution» has nowhere led to socialism, we think there is no need of very much «creative scrutiny» and «speculation», for this is quite evident and, as a popular proverb has it «one needs no guide to a village in sight». But even in this assertion Amendola distorts the truth for he strives to cover up the treason of social democracy to the cause of socialism, to cover up the fact that it has long become the watchdog of the class of capitalists, and he treats the matter as if social-democracy has earnestly striven and strives to promote socialism but that «the solution proposed by it» does not seem to have been of the grade required!

But what is of more importance is that G. Amendola ignores the heretofore historic experience of victorious socialism, and concretely, that of the Soviet Union and of China, calls this experience of no value and unsuitable for Italy and for the other advanced capitalist states of the West. He says: «Our fight is waged under other historical conditions. . . . ,. Is is precisely for this reason that we do not advise the Soviet and Chinese experiences as a pattern for our struggle but take great pains to find a new way to advance towards socialism» («Socialism in the West», Rinascita, November 1964).

The question arises: Why do these experiences which have led to the victory of socialism in one third of the world, seem to be «of no value and «inadvisable» for Italy? What are, according to Amendola, the basic features which will characterize transition to socialism in Italy at variance with the way pursued by the Soviet Union or China?

Amendola presents at least six such basic features which deserve attention:

1) According to Amendola, this will be a «specific», «all Italian» way of transition to socialism. He says: «If a single party of the Italian workers will be set up, it will be the party of the *Italian way* (underlined by the editors) towards socialism» («Hypotheses»).

Of course, every country possesses its own peculiarities of transition to socialism, which depend both on the national conditions of each country and on the corresponding historical epochs. It is quite necessary to take these into consideration so as to work out a correct line, a correct strategy and tactics in revolution, because these peculiarities determine the forms, rhythms and methods of transition to socialism for various countries. Whereas neglecting them leads to dogmatism, to departure from objective reality and from the masses, it affects the cause of socialism for the worse.

But it is at the same time necessary not to forget for a single moment that, as rightly pointed out in the 1957 joint Declaration of the communist and workers parties, there exist general laws of the socialist revolution and of building socialism which make up the very essence of this process and which, as a consequence, are essential and binding for any country going over to socialism and for all epochs. These general laws have been discovered by marxism-leninism and have been tested in practice by the entire historical experience of the international communist and workers movement. They have been substantiated especially in the historical experience of the Soviet Union, of the People's Republic of China and of the other socialist countries, and are,

therefore, of great value to all other countries. It is appropriate to refer here to V.I. Lenin's familiar words from his work «On the Infantile Ailment» that «certain basic features of our revolution are not only of local, specific national, of Russian but of international importance», that «the Russian pattern imparts to all countries something, something very essential of their inevitable and immediate future», as well as his words that «bolshevism is a tactical model for all».

Failure to take the general laws of transition socialism into account and ignoring the fundamental historical experience of the Soviet Union, of People's China and of other socialist countries leads inevitably to departure from the positions of revolutionary marxism-leninism and to slipping into the worst opportunism and revisionism. And this is precisely G. Amendola's position who ignores the general line and places national peculiarities in the foreground considering them as absolute while he discards as unfit and of no value the basic experience of the Soviet Union and of China. It is evident that G. Amendola stands in the positions of the so-called «national communism», which is a variation of the bourgeois and anticommunist theory in vogue.

2) According to Amendola, the Soviet and Chinese experiences are of no value because these were relatively backward countries, whereas Italy is and advanced capitalist country. He says that the problem lying before them (that is, before the Italian Communist Party and the socialist party) is «... to proceed towards socialism in an advanced capitalist country, in a country like ours, with its own historical problems, with its own Catholic movement, with the resistence of the old strata of population, with

the inheritance of fascism and so on» («Hypotheses»).

In connection with this let us point to certain matters:

Firstly, according to Amendola, it turns out that there seem to be two kinds of socialism: one kind of socialism for backward countries, the way to which has been shown by marxism-leninism, and another kind of socialism for «advanced» countries, for which marxism-leninism has not pointed out the way so far, therefore, Amendola and his companions are «taking great pains» to find it! This sounds very much like the familiar preachings of bourgeois propagandists who claim that the marxist doctrine was effective for certain backward countries but failed in developed countries.

Secondly, Amendola distorts history in a grotesque way when he makes allusions pretending that so far there exists no model for transition to socialism in highly developed capitalist countries, for, as everybody knows, Czechoslovakia or the German Democratic Republic for instance, were formerly highly developed capitalist countries.

But this reveals also something else: Amendola speaks only of *two models* of transition, whereas he does not take into account the other socialist countries. Apparently, he cherishes the opinion that the other socialist countries have no «way of their own» of transition to socialism, but have either copied the Soviets or the Chinese, or that the revolution, he thinks, has been «exported» to these countries (at least in Europe) from the Soviet Union during the time of the Second World War! Such anti-marxist and chauvinist notes we have in fact heard even before in the writings by P. Togliati and other Italian revisionists.

Thirdly, as to G. Amendola's assertions that «the communist solution» has given no results in the West, the blame for this does not lie with «the communist solution» at all, which has led to the triumph of the revolution in one-third of the world, but above all others, and to a considerable extent, with the fact that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party, as the leaders of many other parties in the West, have long departed from the revolutionary positions of marxism-leninism and have plunged into the mire of opportunism, reformism and revisionism.

3) According to Amendola, socialism has triumphed in the Soviet Union under conditions of war, but such a way today is «unsuitable» and «undesirable» because it may lead to an exterminating nuclear slaughter-house that would be an «end of everything». He writes: «... we should look for a new way which would allow us to proceed towards socialism under the concrete conditions created by our history and of our own times, of the time of the struggle for *peaceful coexistence*, in other words, an Italian way to socialism» («Hypotheses»).

What can this mean? Where do these words convey?

Amendola repeats here more or less Togliati's idea that transition to socialism so far has been effected through deep world crises — of 1917 and of 1945 — both of them related with the world war. Facts reject this anti-marxist conclusion which is a slander against the revolution and socialism. The war is neither the cause nor a necessary condition for the triumph of the revolution. The revolution won in China in 1949, that is, four years after the

end of the Second World War and in Cuba it won in 1959, or 14 years after the end of the war.

Repeating Togliati again Amendola says that the way of winning the revolution through war is unsuitable and out of question. But who is that marxist or that marxist-leninist party which has considered or considers the victory of socialism through war fitting and desirable? This is a gross calumny borrowed from most reactionary bourgeois propagandists. Communists have abided and always abide by the leninist thesis that the revolution cannot be exported by either the war or by peaceful coexistence.

But what is «the way to socialism under conditions of peaceful coexistence»? It is the way to make socialism dependent upon peaceful co-existence, to submit it to peaceful co-existence, to subordinate everything to peaceful coexistence. In other words this means that one should give up the revolution, should abstain from overthrowing the bourgeoisie, should renounce establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the sake and in the name of peaceful co-existence, that one should extend peaceful co-existence also in relations between antagonistic classes in the capitalist countries so as to perpetuate the capitalist order.

And all this is done for the alleged purpose of sparing mankind a new exterminating nuclear butchery that «would be the end of everything» in the world. But under whatever guise they may appear it is clear that the revisionists are scared to death, that they have succumbed to the atomic blackmail of the imperialists, that they have become voluntary propagandists of this blackmail, that they have plunged into the mire of pessimism and of defeatism,

that they have lost all faith in the future, that they have abandoned revolutionary ideals and have adopted peace, peace at any cost, peace on earth and in heaven, as their highest aim.

4) According to Amendola it turns out that the Soviet and Chinese patterns are of no value to Italy, for they seem to be «undemocratic», whereas the «Italian way to socialism» promises to be «a truly democratic» way! He writes: «we insist on this way, on this Italian and *democratic* (underlined by the editors) way to socialism» («Socialism in the West»). Amendola is fully at one with all those who protested against «the anti-democratic» way of ousting Khrushchev in the Soviet Union and gives vent to his «criticism and disapproval» regarding the delay to overcome the contrast which exists to this very day between the development of the socialist basis of the Soviet system and the development of the democratic structure which will provide «observance of democratic and personal freedom» and «factual participation of workers in running all social life» . . . » (ibidem).

Amendola refers to P. Togliati, particularly to his Yalta «TESTAMENT», in order to justify before his critics from the right wing that they, i.e. the Italian revisionists, had long before N. Khrushchev's downfall raised the question of «democratizing» and «liberalizing» the Soviet system further and more rapidly, in other words, the question of further degenerating the socialist order in the Soviet Union and in the countries of People's Democracy more rapidly into a bourgeois-liberal order. And Amendola, just as Togliati and refering to him, strives to inveigle the social-democrats, the bourgeois liberals, the catholics and other possible allies to the «Italian way

to socialism», tries to persuade them that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is a «Stalinite distortion» which must be put a speedy end to and which will not be tolerated by the revisionists in «socialist Italy».

Whereas V.I. Lenin considered the dictatorship of the proletariat, which the modern revisionists of the type of Amendola and C° have erased from books as an inacceptale and «anti-democratic» order, as the most democratic order which human society has known to this day. He has stressed that proletarian democracy as *a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, «is a million times more* democratic than any bourgeois democracy; the Soviet power is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic. This may fail to come under the notice of only a conscientious servant of the bourgeoisie or of a politically dead man who does not see life as it is because of the dust-covered bourgeois books, of a man infected from head to foot with bourgeois-democratic prejudices, who turns himself, objectively, with this into a lackey of the bourgeoisie» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 28, page 227).

This, then, is at what post — at the cost of renouncing the revolution, at the cost of discrediting, degenerating and doing away with the socialist order, with the dictatorship of the proletariat with the achievements of socialism, G. Amendola and other modern revisionists want to win over allies for their so-called «Italian way to socialism», which in fact is the way of preerving and perpetuating capitalism.

5) According to Amendola it turns out that the «Italian way» is likewise the «peaceful» way of

advancing towards socialism through carrying out the «structural reforms» envisaged within the framework of the present Italian constitution! It is significant that in this matter «communist» Amendola tends more to the right than the bourgeois liberal N. Bobbio himself who charcaterizes the present Italian constitution as «a constitution of liberal democracy (and not of the people's democracy)» (see Bobbio's letter to Amendola published in «Rinascita» dated November 28, 1964). Whereas Amendola opposes this and says that the present Italian constitution «cannot be called a simple constitution of «liberal-democracy» as Bobbio claims. In fact the constitution includes demands and institutions which have neither been observed nor carried out during these last twenty years by the various coalition governments directed by Christian Democracy, which point out what «progressive» society character «the Republic founded on labor» should have had. The development of the original elements of this constitution, the incitement of political and social tension through an uninterrupted and perpetual mobilization of the masses, means to create conditions for a democratic and socialist transformation of society through applying structual reforms, political and economic reforms« («Hypotheses»).

Obviously, the basic theses of the marxist-leninist doctrine on transition from capitalism to socialism have been wiped out from G. Amendola's and all other modern revisionists' vocabulary, the very notion of «socialist revolution» has been erased; the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, issues which Lenin has said «draw the deep line of distinction

between a marxist and any ordinary petty (or high) bourgeois» have been wiped out, (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 25, p. 384) and that «it is highly important, to the point of excluding from membership in the social-democratic party, any one who denies or accepts it only in words» (Works, Russian edition, volume 23, page 57); the familiar marxist-leninist thesis on the indispensability of breaking the bourgeois state machine as one of the decisive conditions for transition to socialism, of which Lenin has said: «this conclusion is the main fundamental thing in the doctrine of marxism on the state» (Works, Russian edition, vol. 25, p. 378), has been discarded.

To any one who is more or less acquainted with marxist literature and with the history of the workers and communist movement of the last fifty years the «critical re-examination» of the experience of which G. Amendola boasts so much, it is very clear that his so called «creative and original research» for a «new way» to socialism is not at all novel nor original but the revival of the old and forgotten theories of the former reformists and opportunists like the economists and Kautzky, which have long been discarded by V.I. Lenin. This can be illustrated by many examples. Here are some of them:

As early as 1899 V.I. Lenin wrote: «.... R.M. (Rabochaya Misl», a newspaper of the Russian «economists»-editors) speaks only of the transfer of production to their (workers') management, or to the management of the democratized social power» through their (workers') active participation in meetings to examine most diverse problems of factories and workshops in arbitration courts, in various meet-

ings, commissions and consultations to work out labor legislation through the active participation of workers in social self-management and, finally, in the general representative institutions of the country». In this manner, the editors of «Rabochaya Misl» include in the workers socialism only a socialism of the kind which is achieved in a *peaceful* way, excluding the revolutionary way» (V.I. Lenin, Works, Russian edition, vol. 4, page 253). It is this kind of socialism, or more accurately, this «way to socialism», which ignores the essential — the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the rule of the proletariat, a way which resembles like two drops of water the preachings of the present Italian revisionists on the «democratization» of the management of capitalist production through the active participation of the working class in it, on increasing the influence of the Italian working class in all government offices and social life in Italy and so on and so forth (i. e. on «structural reforms»), it is precisely this «socialism» that Lenin has designated as «a narrowing down of socialism and its reduction to ordinary bourgeois liberalism» (ibid).

Or let us see what K. Kautzky has to say. «... The purpose of strikes by the masses» he writes, «can never be to *to destroy* state power but only to oblige the government to make concessions on a given issue, or to replace a government opposed to the proletariat with a government which is well disposed to it.... But this («that is, the victory of the proletariat over the government of the opposition») can never lead to the destruction of state power, but only to some sort of replacement of the ratio of forces *within the state power*... Therefore,

the purpose of our political struggle remains as heretofore, the assumption of state power by winning the majority in parliament and by making parliament master over the government». If one had not known that this has been written by Kautzky, one would really think that this was a quotation from P. Togliati, G. Amendola or from any of their modern revisionist colleagues, for so similar are their views on «crossing over to socialism» through winning the majority in parliament, on setting up a «true democratic» and «popular» government of «the left-wing bloc» and so on with the above mentioned views of K. Kautzky. And this is how V.I. Lenin has assessed these views: «Here we have opportunism in its purest and most commonplace form; here we have, in fact, a renunciation of the revolution accepted in words» (Works, vol. 25, p. 459, Russian edition). Further on, Lenin says: «.... we shall break off with these traitors to socialism and will fight to destroy the whole state machinery of the old so that the armed proletariat itself *may become the government*. Here we have 'two major divergences' Kautzky wants to join the sweet company of Legins and Davids, Plekhanovs, Potresovs, Cheretels, who are entirely of the same mind to fight for the displacement of the ratio of forces within the state power', for 'winning the majority in parliament and for giving parliament all the power over the government', a very noble objective, in which everything may be accepted by the opportunists, in which everything remains within the framework of the bourgeois parliamentary republic. As for us, we shall break off with the opportunists; and all the conscientious proletariat will be loyal to us in battle not for «a replacement of the ratio of forces», but

for *overthrowing the bourgeoisie,* for *breaking up* bourgeois parliamentarism, for setting up the democratic republic of the Commune type, or the Republic of the Soviets of the representatives of workers and soldiers, for the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat» (ibid pp 459—460).

We need not dwell any longer on the analysis of the entirely opportunist and reformist views of G. Amendola and of all the Italian Togliatite revisionists regarding the so called «Italian way to socialism», a thing we have already done in detail in former materials, particularly in the article published in the November 17 & 18, 1962 issues of the «Zeri i Popullit» daily, «On the theses of the Xth Congress of the Italian Communist Party». We will only point out here that G. Amendola's so called «criticism» of the social-democratic «solution» is nothing but a brazen demagogical maneuver. In fact, while he opposes in essence «the communist solution», that is, the fundamental teachings of marxism-leninism on transition from capitalism to socialism, G. Amendola proposes in essence the social-democratic «solution»: instead of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie, of the destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he proposes «structural reforms» within the framework of bourgeois legality and the bourgeois constitution, «a gradual change of the ratio of forces in parliament and in all bourgeois state offices» «in favor of the working class», he proposes using the bourgeois state for «limitting all power of monopolies» and for «advancing towards socialism», making the so-called «peaceful way» to socialism an absolute one and excluding every true revolutionary act against bour-

geois domination; negating unconditionally the dictatorship of the proletariat as an «anti-democratic» order and crossing over to socialism through the forms of the «present bourgeois democracy» and so on and so forth.

N. Bobbio is fully justified in revealing without demagogical by-paths the essence of the matter: «It is evident» he writes to G. Amendola, «that to practice a policy, and a government policy at that, in a state led by a constitution of liberal democracy (and not a people's democracy) means to practice a social-democratic policy. One should not be afraid of words.... There is one single party of the workers movement in Italy today which accepts the institutions in power... and consequently, is prepared to respect the principles of parliamentary government based on abiding by civil and political rights and which *can not but practice a policy which is a social-democratic policy.* I do not see why you dodge the issue when speaking of social-democracy in your reply and try to suppress the very least doubt that our policy might be confounded with that of the social democrats..... Allow me to assert that I see this in your request to take part in governing Italy: that you have already been convinced that this is the only policy possible in present—day Italy, twenty years after the war and ten years after the cold war» (Bobbio's letter to G. Amendola published in «Rinascita» date November 28, 1964).

From revising the fundamental principles of marxism-leninism to abandoning them altogether and to liquidating the communist party

In his articles G. Amendola touches also the character, the ideological and political as well as organizational profile which «the single party of the working class» should have. Amendola's and his supporters' liquidating line of betrayal is manifested in this matter more openly than anywhere else. But let us see what he actually says:

G. Amendola treats the question in this manner: As long as neither the social democratic solution nor the communist solution have yielded any results in Italy (and in the West as a whole), during these last fifty years, then the new party should be neither a social democratic nor a communist one, but something «entirely new», standing above both! Amendola writes: «Unification in Italy cannot be made either on the basis of social-democratic positions or on the basis of communist positions. *It cannot be made* because of the ratio of forces and *it should not be made* if we want to set up a new party («Hypotheses»).

Amendola says also: «The new single party should be set up on the basis of a political program of renewal being *open to without ideological obstacles* for all those approving of its program. It cannot be either «ideologically neutral» or ideologically limited but a politically active party capable of attracting *forces of different origins and inspirations* to its political program. The single party should include in it the contribution of the most advanced trends of modern thought, so as to achieve a fruitful

encounter between materialist dialectic thought that contains and develops the teachings of Marx, Lenin, Labriola, Gramsci and othe philosophical and cultural positions. It is understood that in this case too *one cannot pretend that the single party be set up on the ideological positions of the communist vanguard*» (Hypotheses) (underlined by the editors). According to Amendola's own words, this would be a big single party of the working class, «which will make place for communists, socialists and people like Bobbio who are worthy representatives of the continuation of the liberal battle. . . » («Socialism in the West»).

To every communist it is clear as sunshine that the course proposed by G. Amendola is a totally regressive and liquidatory course and constitutes a major betrayal to the interests of the Italian working class and to the cause of socialism.

It is a fact that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, all the true proletarian revolutionaries everywhere have devoted and continue to devote all their efforts and energies to the struggle of setting up and consolidating sound revolutionary parties of the working class armed with marxist-leninist theory, of drawing a clear line with and getting rid of opportunists, reformists, revisionists, capitulators and renegates of all hues, for without doing this there can be no question of either the true revolutionary movement of the working class or of overthrowing the capitalist order of exploitation, or of establishing socialism. This has been proven in an indisputable way by more than one hundred years' experience of the world workers and communist movement.

Whereas G. Amendola, together with all the Italian Togliattite revisionists and others are rapidly

pursuing quite a contrary course, the course of liquidating the revolutionary marxist-leninist vanguard of the working class — the communist parties, leaving the workers disarmed and without a guiding militant staff against a powerful and well organized bourgeoisie. Thus they have long put the Italian Communist Party which used to be revolutionary marxist-leninist party, on the way of degenerating into a social-democratic one, while now they are trying to liquidate it completely and totally, merging it with social democracy within the framework of the so called «single party».

As it turns out quite openly from Amendola's own assertions he wants to give up marxism-leninism as an ideological basis of the party of the working clas. And this is quite evident as far as, according to Amendola, «the communist ideological positions» have so far indicated no way out and have given no results at least in Italy and in Western Europe.

This means discarding as worthless all the gigantic work of the founders of scientific communism, denying the role and vital importance of marxist-leninist theory, renouncing all revolutionary communist ideals and all revolutionary socialist movement, plunging ultimately into the mire of spontaneity. Every plain communist is acquainted with the ideas of the classics of marxism on the major organizational, mobilizing and transforming role of marxist-leninist theory which explains to the workers the objective, sheds light on their road, opens perspectives and shows them the means, serves them as a sure guide in their fight for socialism and communism. Marx has said: «When theory wins over the masses it turns into a great material force»

while Lenin emphasized that «without a revolutionary theory there cannot be a revolutionary movement» that «the role of vanguard fighter can be played only by a party that is guided by a vanguard theory».

Revisionists began their betrayal by revising the principles of the basic teachings of marxism-leninism while Amendola is now calling for a rejection and an ultimate abandonment of marxism-leninism, for breaking up and liquidating altogether the revolutionary party of the working class armed with communist ideology. This means that the revisionists are severring all connections with marxism-leninism and with the revolutionary workers movement, that they are flinging away even their pseudo-socialist and pseudo-marxist demagogy and guise, that they are stripping bare their traitorous features, their complete degeneration into renegades to the working class and to socialism.

By rejecting «the ideological positions of the communist vanguard» Amendola says that the new party cannot be set up on the basis of the ideological positions of social-democracy either, since the latter have given no results too. But then what will be the ideological basis of the unique party of the working class and will this party have any such basis? In the world there exist but two ideologies and «the question» Lenin has stressed, «is posed in this manner: either bourgeois ideology or socialist ideology There is no middle way here. Therefore, any curtailment of socialist ideology, any departure from it, means, at the same time, a strengthening of the bourgeois ideology» (V.I. Lenin, Selected Works, Albanian edition, vol. 1, page 137).

Whereas Amendola says: «the single party should include the contribution of the most advanced trends of modern thought», that it should be «an arena of encounter» (read: of grafting») the most diverse philosophic, cultural and other views and positions. Thus, the question here is to rise above both camps in ideology in order to create a certain third thing, a middle thing, a grafting between socialist ideology and a bourgeois, social-democratic ideology.

Attempts of this kind to rise above the two camps in ideology are not a novelty. Many others before Amendola have striven «to overpass the onesidedness» of the two opposing ideologies. But what has the outcome been? The result has been that all those who made such attempts have slided into the positions of the worst, of the most reactionary ideology, have turned into servants of the bourgeoisie and of reaction. By abandoning the positions of communist ideology and by trying to find a third way, Amendola and C° will also be sharing the same fate. But what concerns us here is not the fate of Amendola and his companions, who have conscientiously plunged themselves into the way of treason, but the fate and future of the workers movement and its revolutionary course. By preaching rejection of «the positions of communist ideology» Amendola flings the gate open for a complete and unhampered subjugation of the party and the entire Italian workers movement to the influence of bourgeois ideology, represented by the pseudo-socialist and pseudo-marxist ideology of the social-democrats, of the liberals and so on. This would be a total capitulation and unconditional surrender of the working class and of its revolutionary party to the bourgeoisie.

Feeling that a position of this kind would expose him badly Amendola says that the single party of the working class will have no «common ideological basis», that diverse ideological trends will co-exist in it in a peaceful and friendly manner. *Thus, he wants giving up the principle of proletarian partyship in ideology extending peaceful co-existence in the ideological field as well, while the party to be turned into a club of endless debate, into a parliament of the bourgeois type, into a party of dwaddlers, for it is clear that without a sound unity in the party on the basis of the theory of scientific socialism there can be no unity of action.* And what party can that be where there is neither unity of thought nor unity of action, what can the working class expect of such a party which hardly may be called a party at all?

The only basis on which the new party will be set up, Amendola continues, will be «a joint political program of fighting for socialism». But how is it possible to pursue a consistent socialist policy without being guided by marxist-leninist science which is the theoretic basis of proletarian socialist policy? There are here three possibilities: either that socialism may be achieved on the basis of diverse ideologies guided by various classes and parties, or that there are different kinds of socialism: a socialism that may be achieved on the basis of the ideologies and of the teachings of marxism-leninism and a number of other «socialisms» that may be achieved on the basis of other non-marxist ideologies; or that to achieve socialism, ideology plays no role, it is, so to speak, neutral and of no practical value.

Amendola's thesis coincides in all respects with

the familiar opportunist views of P. Togliatti and the Yugoslav revisionists who claim that the fight for socialism can be led not only by the working class and its communist vanguard armed with marxist-leninist theory but also by classes, categories, groups, parties and organizations which do not even call themselves socialists. And all of these have their source on the anti-marxist thesis of «a spontaneous objective drive» towards socialism.

And it is clear that so long as the new party will not have a single ideological basis, so long as most diverse ideological and political trends will concur in it, this party will be open to all, to socialists, social-democrats, Catholics, bourgeois-liberals and soon and so forth, its class character as a proletarian party will disappear, it will turn into a «party of all the Italian people» following the example of «the party of all the people» of the Khrushchevite revisionists. This will thus not be a party of the working class to lead its revolutionary class struggle but a party of all classes to establish peace and harmony among them.

At variance with the preachings of modern revisionists the classics of marxism-leninism have waged a firm and principled battle for the purity of the ranks of communist parties, stressing that their strength does not lie in numbers but in the quality of the members that compose them. Thus, for instance, by bitterly condemning the opportunist renegates of the IInd International in 1920, V.I. Lenin wrote in his Letter to German and French workers: «Without ousting this trend which through its waverings, its «menshevism», ... is really inserting bourgeois influence to the proletariat *within* the workers movement, *within* the socialist parties, wi-

thout ousting this trend, without breaking off with it, without expelling all its prominent representatives the unity of the revolutionary proletariat *is impossible...* It is high time to finally dispel all these very dangerous illusions on the possibility of «unity» or of «peace» with Ditmanns and Crispins, with the right wing of the German «Independent Social Democratic Party», with the «Independent Workers Party» of England, with the «Socialist Party of France» and so on. It is high time for all revolutionary workers to cleanse their parties of these elements and to form real united communist parties of the proletariat (V.I. Lenin, «Against Revisionism», Albanian edition pages 616 & 617).

These liquidatory views of G. Amendola on openly renouncing communist ideological position and on merging the Italian Communist Party with social democrats, bourgeois liberals and others are so abashing that his revisionist colleagues themselves did not publicly claim them for their own, calling them «rash», «not well weighed» «obscure», «not entirely accurate» and even «criticized» them. But Amendola rejected these «criticisms» as unjustifiable and unjust and brought forth two «arguments» in his defense:

On one hand he wrote that he had been »misunderstood». In the article «Unified Battle for Socialism» appearing in «Rinascita», dated December 12, 1964, Amendola writes that he had never intended to preach the renunciation of the communist ideology. He says: «We, the communists will come to this meeting (i.e. «the single party of the working class» together with socialists—editors) with our own, ideas, with our own force, with our thesaurus of ideals.... Who has said that this thesaurus of ours should be

wiped out? Well, this thesaurus of ours, our force, our political opinion, our revolutionary will will be our contribution to the new party, will be our dowry». But this is a very crude fraud that will hardly deceive anybody Amendola tries to screen off the sunrays with a sieve for every one will undoubtedly pose the very simple question: Of what use are to «the single party» the political opinion and the ideology of the communist party, «its thesaurus of ideals» as Amendola calls it, when he himself puts forth, as a basic argument for the need of seeting up this «single party», the very fact that this «thesaurus« seems to have yielded no results during these recent fifty years in Italy and elsewhere in the West? In the same article of December 12 he even contradicts himself when he says: «There is no question of trying to find 'a midway' (that is, between the communist and social-democrat positions—editors)... On the contrary, we want not a half-way, but a way *further ahead,* beyond the positions acquired in the past, a new strategy of combat for socialism. with a platform in which the unity of the working class may be achieved not by taking no account of the past divergences, but by *overpassing* them in a new perspective of advancing towards socialism». Thus, communist positions, the communist «thesaurus» should also be overpassed, that is, by discarding it! This is the ridiculous position which Amendola has taken with his extremely liquidatory revisionism.

On the other hand, Amendola defends himself from the «criticism» of his revisionist colleagues by holding out before their eyes the «authority» of their common «teacher» P. Togliatti who had long opened the door of the Italian Communist Party

to most varied, non-marxist elements and tendencies. He writes: «I wish to remind those comrades who have no patience to see the new party in its shorts that the Italian Communist Party became the party it is now because a daring policy of unity enabled it to lead the Resistance and be transformed, in the heat of battle for liberation, from a party of cadres to a great party of the masses, to a party of the new type, demanding of its members only to engage in fighting for carrying out its *political program,* which was a program of the reconstruction and democratic revival of Italy. The older ones recall, of course, the scepticism and resistance which Togliatti's line met with regarding the formation of the new party, they recall of course, the admittance of «Catholic communists» of positivists, of idealists, of anarchists to the ranks of the new party. There were even criticisms on the international scale for what seemed and what really was a transformation of the nature of the party But inspite of all these misgivings we forged ahead precisely because we picked on that course and formed that party... opening its doors without fear and misgivings, without strict examination of admittance to any one who was prepared to fight for the application of its political program». We think comments are superfluous. In other words, Amendola tells his revisionist colleagues who are more reserved and not so rash: Why do you molest me with your «criticisms» when you very well know that we, all of us, with Togliati in the lead, have long been pursuing the course of «transforming» the Italian Communist Party and we have since many years opened its doors to socialists and social-democrats, bourgeois-democrats and Catholics, idealists and

anarchists of the most various hues? Whereas now when it is high time to crown our many years of struggle with the union and complete merger with «our brothers of the class», the social-democrats, in the ranks of «the great single party of the working class», you kick and pretend you are not in agreement of! Leave jokes aside and let us set to work and create «the single party» as soon as possible, which is the inevitable logical conclusion of our line of many years! It was exactly with such a call that Amendola wound up his article «... I think», he writes «that our party should embark without reserve or fear or misgivings, with all its force on the battle for the political unity of the working class».

Such are Amendola's views regarding the contact and merger of the Communist Party with the socialist and social democrat ones. They are the clearest proof that the modern revisionists have already embarked on the road to ultimately liquidate the communist and workers parties. Liquidation, this is the station to which the train of revisionism is heading for.

II

Judging by Amendola's views, by the discussion about his «hypotheses» and by the whole platform of modern revisionists one can easily come to the conclusion that we do not have to deal here with an isolated phenomenon of the moment. On the contrary, facts go to prove in a very clear way that Amendola's views are a concrete expression of the line of the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party, of the Soviet revisionists, and of the

entire international modern revisionism, they are an unmasked expression of their treacherous, liquidatory objectives. The question here is that Amendola has not only revealed his views but that he has stripped naked the entire modern revisionism, that he has torn the «marxist» mask to the liquidatory views expressed by P. Togliati, L. Longo, N. Khrushchev and others during these recent years and encouraged the other revisionists to blurt out their views and aims somewhat more openly. In short he, as an extremist and aggressive revisionist, called over their bluff regarding «their clever and well worked out» tactics to which they resorted in new situations in which they have met with a series of irrepairable defeats.

At the same time Amendola's theses and the views manifested during this discussion are also an expression of the divergences existing within the ranks of revisionist groupings. Our Party has more than once emphasized that the façade of «unity» of the modern revisionists is nothing but a bluff, that they, as enemies of marxism-leninism and counterrevolutionaries, cannot be friends with one another, that, as Comrade Enver Hoxha has said, «the law of the jungle» is ever so prevalent among them. And these divergencies are of a two-fold character: different tactics to attain the same objective, as, for example, the liquidation of the party; deeper issues dealing with submitting or depending on one another, with the «bandmaster's bâton», or «polycentrism», etc. Thus this discussion reflects the deep growing crisis which modern revisionism is undergoing both on a national scale (Italy) as well as on an international scale.

G. Amendola's line is the line of all the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party

When discussion about Amendola's «Hypotheses» was at its height and when leaders of the Italian Socialist Party, liberals and others hailed it openly and with enthusiasm, it was joined in also by certain prominent leaders of the Italian Communist Party, like its Secretary-General Luigi Longo, Member of the leadership Gian Carlo Paieta, Member of the Central Committee Romano Leda and others who hurried to express their opinions too. The latter, scared by the proportions which the discussion was taking and by the airing of revisionist ideas in public, feigned to contradict Amendola's views and to criticise them, a thing the Soviet leaders took advantage of in drawing the version that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party had allegedly rejected Amendola's ideas. But a comparison with their views reveals the contrary, to wit:

Firstly, that Amendola's «Hypotheses» as a whole coincide to the letter with the general revisionist line of the leaders of the Italian Communist Party;

Secondly, that the so-called «criticism» of certain leaders of the Italian Communist Party is not directed at all towards the essence of the liquidatory views of Amendola;

Thirdly, that the leadership of the Italian Communist Party have in no way, not even formally, rejected Amendola's theses.

Let us prove this:

Amendola's «Hypotheses» are an organic part of Togliati's revisionism, they fully concur with P. Togliati's views and acts eversince the Second World War to the day of his death. It is a fact that, proceed-

ing from entirely revisionist conceptions, Togliati has more than once maintained the thesis that it is not only the communists but also other parties and forces which fight for socialism in Italy and elsewhere. Thus, at a meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party in June 1956 he had said: «We may in fact see an impetus towards socialism and a more or less clear orientation towards economic reforms and transformations of the socialist type also in countries where Communist Parties far from taking part in the government are not even a great force.... This situation reigns today and assumes special significance in those regions of the world newly liberated from colonialism. But also in highly advanced capitalist countries it may happen that the working class, in its majority, may follow a non-communist party and it cannot be gainsaid that in these countries too the non-communist parties, but based on the working class, may express the urge coming from the working class for advancement towards socialism. The tendency to carry out radical economic changes in a direction which in general is that of socialism may finally come also from organizations and movements which do not call themselves socialist». And not only this but on this basis he has more than once raised the question of creating a single party as a practical and immediate objective.

The present Secretary-General of the Italian Communist Party, L. Longo, tries to use these views of his as an argument of discussion when he writes that as regards the question of a special contact with all the organized political forces which consider themselves, in one way or another, inspired by socialism, P. Togliati has said:

«There is no question», let us say it outright «of a turn in the people's front» but of «opening before the popular masses a programmatic, political and *even organizational debate* to take up and solve the problem of how to find some kind of unity *under present conditions* for all forces which call themselves socialists». P. Togliati was even opposed to those who considered the creation of a single party as «a dream», and said that «this problem exists and we must raise it», that «we have to deal with a problem which should be seized and laid before the ranks of the working class and of the laboring masses».

Thus, Togliati had worked out, among others, the theoretic basis of liquidating the party and had laid out the concrete task of putting these liquidatory views into effect long before Amendola's «Hypotheses» had appeared and the present discussions had begun. Thus, Amendola and his «dissentient» companions have borrowed from Togliati the weapons with which they try to deny the role of the party and of the revolutionary theory, of marxism-leninism in the struggle of the working class and the laboring masses for socialism, to place the sign of equality between communist and other bourgeois parties and to merge them into one single party, with the purpose of leaving the working class disarmed and of turning its party from a tool of the revolution and of the dictatorship of the proletariat to a tool of the counter-revolution and of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

In contrast to Amendola who makes use of Togliati's extremist expressions, the present leader of the Italian Communist Party, L. Longo, resorts to his «more moderate» expressions in his article, like that by which Togliati was in favor of «a party of the masses and of a combative party», qualities which

«can be substantiated in diverse ways, according to diverse situations and which would give rise to «diverse structures». Looking at the essence of the problem as a whole, it is thus not difficult to trace the same thing pronounced by Amendola, that Togliati had in mind a disorganized party with no sound discipline, open to all as the discussion to which we are referring maintains.

Of course we pointed out here only those views of Togliati's related in a concrete and more direct way to the basic theme of the discussion in «Rinascita», to the question of the «single party». But the fact is that these are part of the whole, of all his revisionist views on «the Italian way to socialism», and serve the realization of Togliati's «socialism». This coincides in full with what Amendola raises, with «the third way», to socialism, which is neither communist nor social democratic, and to which the «new party» will serve. Therefore, just as the starting point and objectives are the same so are identical the views on the form and substance and means to realize these aims, on the party

What about the present leaders of the Italian Communist Party, do they in essence hold the same opinion as Amendola on the «creation of the single party», do they oppose or approve of them?

To answer this it would have sufficed to say that both the one side as well as the other base their discussions entirely on P Togliati, on his speeches and articles during the last twenty years, and particularly on his Yalta «Testament». But since the former addressed certain «criticisms» to the latter, we will dwell a little in more detail on this matter.

It is not that the present Secretary-General of the Italian Communist Party, Luigi Longo, comes out

only now with his revisionist and liquidating ideas on the party which are identical with those of Amendola's though, now and then, more camouflaged and with certain shades of «disapproval» of the tactics pursued by the latter. No! On the contrary he has expressed them clearly as far back as at the Vth Congress of the Italian Communist Party nearly twently years ago. And that these ideas of his are approved as very actual by Togliatist revisionists are verified by the fact that certain portions of his report read in that Congress were republished in «Rinascita» on December 26, 1964, within the discussion of the significant caption: «Fusion is a sincere aspiration of ours».

At that time L. Longo stated among others:

«For us communists the question of fusion is not and should not be a case of polemics to fight or split the Socialist Party. It is and it should be a well defined desire to unite the socialists and communists, to unite all the sincere democrats, for this is an exigency of the actual moment and for its sake it is necessary to abandon all paltry personal and party considerations». And he continues:

«We have never stated that our methods of work, our political program and our ideology should be forming the basis of the single party of the Italian workers... Guarantees should exist that no one will be compelled, that no one will be humiliated, but that all will join and collaborate in the single party with dignity with absolutely equal rights, by even preserving those things peculiar to them and enjoying the right of membership in any democratic party».

Does it not follow clearly from this that there is not only a full identity of views but also that L. Longo, just as Togliati himself, has long ago «assisted»

Amendola to adopt the views expressed in his «Hypotheses», that the former was one of the teachers of the latter? Both of them consider the socialists, democrats and others as partisans of socialism, both of them are in favor of abandoning «paltry personal and party» considerations, both of them uphold the renunciation of marxist-leninist ideology and the political program of the communist party for a «third» ideology and program. Since they have long discarded (and do the same thing today) the concept of the class struggle, they have discarded also Lenin's great ideas on the political, ideological and organizational bases of the revolutionary party of the proletariat by proclaiming the views on an unprincipled unity without conditions with any party or person whatsoever, provided it or he considers itself and himself «socialist», «democrat». This is what L. Longo did twenty years ago and this is what he and his companions do today.

One of Amendola's «critics» who is quoted most amiably by the Soviet revisionists in the «Communist» in their criticism of Amendola is also Member of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party Romano Leda. In his article he treats questions of the general revisionist line of the Italian Communist Party with which Amendola is in full agreement and arrives at the common view of the indispensability of creating «the single party».

Like Amendola, R. Leda maintains the view that one should not give up «re-examining in a critical way all those things that should be renewed and all those things of leninism that should be discussed», that one should «renew and override those strategical formulations which met with the revolutionary demands of the past», that «the communist movement

as a whole did not succeed in grasping from a rigorous marxist-leninist view» the new problems which the development of the situation has given rise to (here Ledo adds that «Togliati had once said that the key-problem of the European workers movement has been that of «opening a 'new chapter' of marxism-leninism»). R. Leda says also that «the national way» should not be conceived of by the western working class as «a different way to carry out the same revolutionary experience of the past, as a variety with a specific national character of a unique pattern of socialism», but as «a new strategic pattern and of «*socialist*»-construction». Does this not reveal clearly the idea of renouncing leninism and of denying the revolutionary way of the achievements of the communist movement in the past that unities these revisionists? Does this not conform to the letter with Amendola's positions on a «particular way» to socialism, on a specific «socialism» for highly developed capitalist countries, different from that of the countries of the East, and so on? After this it is clearly evident how formal and demagogic is his «criticism» of Amendola.

R. Leda stands on entirely revisionist and reformist grounds as Amendola when he raises the question of the existence of «a new ratio of forces between reform and revolution», when he upholds Togliati's views that «the more capitalism develops the more do the democratic, political and economic reforms «assume a socialist substance», since the present state in Italy is allegedly «different from the one Lenin had foreseen». Do we not see here an effort to prettyfy capitalism and to substitute the revolutionary struggle with reformism which we also see in Amendola?

Although R. Leda admits that the reformist wing in the workers movement (i.e. social-democracy) considers not imperialism and capitalism but the communist revolution as the principal foe, and even collaborates with colonialism and neo-colonialism, he still prettyfies social-democracy saying that this is due to «misunderstanding» and to its «inability» to analyze the present world in a complex manner, that «this cannot be attributed to the betrayal of this or that leader of social democracy, for an assessment of this kind is 'sectarian». Have we not to deal here with the very same endeavors which Amendola makes to cover up the true visage and class basis of reformist social-democracy, to show that it is for «socialism» and as such we can unite with it?

R. Leda, finally pretends that he accepts the marxist-leninist doctrine on the party and on the dictatorship of the proletariat as a permanent factor for transition to socialism. But in a separate footnote he explains that «the dictatorship of the proletariat is not necessarily coertive and at the basis of the single party. The revolution in Russia with Lenin was effected in this concrete way but an act of this kind was universalized by mistake». Thus he conforms in full with Amendola also in denying the role of the marxist-leninist party and of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the revolution and in socialist construction.

Another prominent Togliatist revisionist, member of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, Gian Carlo Paieta, expresses the same ideas as Amendola in an article appearing in «Rinascita» (№ 3) January 1965. He underlines that Italian democracy stands in need of a political party of the masses and this more so because the state and its institutions

intervene directly in problems of economy and production and engage not only in scholastic education but also in educating the masses. Under a situation of this kind, he continues, it is essential to have a party which will be able to exert the influence of the working class and of all the laborers under every circumstance and in all stages of political and economic life.

But that Amendola's views are in essence also the views of the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party were finally openly approved both in the last December meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party and also in its organ «Unita» of December 12, 1964. Thus, writing about the discussion of the Central Committee Member, Trivelli, in the meeting, the paper says that «he approves the political assessment expressed in Amendola's recent article, *which in the final analysis is the position of the party too,* (underlined by the editors) according to which the problem of the unity between forces which call themselves socialist and the problem of the single party itself are problems to be raised right now. Referring to the discussion of another, the same paper admits that «*the leadership of the party itself as a whole has again raised this problem and an allusion to the single party is made also in the statement on elections* (underlined by the editors).

Where then lies the so called «criticism» the leaders of the Italian Communist Party make to G. Amendola? Let us say it right at the start and again that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party *only feigns to criticise* Amendola but in reality they are in full agreement with him both in matters of strategy as well as of tactics. Fearing an exposure

before the masses of the party, they only «moderate» their open assertions, try not to call things by their true names. L. Longo even takes Amendola under his protection when he states in his article on the discussions that «Certain formulations contained in it (in Amendola's article) are rash and may give rise to misunderstanding, as the author himself admitted. . » (Although, as we saw above, Amendola admitted nothing and stood by his own views). L. Longo's only «weighty criticism» to Amendola (and this is the criticism of the majority of his «opponents») is that the latter allegedly does not draw the proper line between two problems, between securing the unity of action with socialists, which is an immediate task, and the creation of «the single party» of the working class, which requires more time, because it is necessary to overcome «the axial differences which still divide the communists from the socialists. Whereas Amendola considers the second problem as an immediate task.

What can one say of a «criticism» of this kind? What is of more importance is the fact that in his «criticism» L. Longo does not criticise the essence of Amendola's thesis on the indispensability of fusing with present social-democracy, nor his theses on the nature of the new party, and so on. He speaks in a vague way of certain «rash formulations» of Amendola's. It is even clear that L. Longo resorts here to demagogy, because, as we said above, he republished a speech he had delivered twenty years ago to the Vth Congress of the Italian Communist Party side by side this article and as actual. In that speech the problem of «the single party» was treated as an immediate task, for, he says, this problem should not be treated in so «abstract» a manner as

Amendola seems to have treated it, but in as concrete a manner as possible, for L. Longo himself admits that the problem raised by Amendola is «a very actual one» and so on.

Highly significant in the essence of this «criticism» is the fact that the leaders of the Italian Communist Party revolt even against the «criticism» of the Soviet revisionist review «Communist» against Amendola which had written that the leadership of the Italian Communist Party had allegedly rejected Amendola's theses. No, is the clearcut reply of «Rinascita» of Jan. 30, 1965. «It is true, of course, that we have upheld and continue to uphold the principles of marxism-leninism: the entire leadership has done this and Comrade Amendola has done it too. But the clear-cut formulation (of the «Communist») claiming that *the leadership of the party and its theoretic organs* have rejected Comrade Amendola's theses, seems to us equivocal».

Thus, it is already clear where the truth of this «criticism» lies and in what revisionist and liquidatory positions the leaders of the Italian Communist Party stand.

Khrushchevite revisionists — sponsors and supporters of the liquidatory course of the Togliatist revisionists

But a «critical» stand towards Amendola's theses was also maintained by the Soviet leaders who proceed likewise from entirely revisionists positions. Why are the Soviet leaders dissatisfied with Amendola and in which are they perfectly in agreement with him?

The organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the «Communist» review № 1 of its January issue this year, assuming the much-covetted pose of a «leader» and unbiased judge, publishes an editorial in which it sums up the discussions that had been entered into about Amendola's theses in the press of the Italian Communist Party, refers to the «criticism» made by L. Longo, R. Leda and others and expresses its own views.

With regard to the problem of «unity» the «Communist» review is in essence fully in agreement, except that it expresses itself in moderated terms of L. Longo demanding that this process should not be hurried and that «unity of action» should first be achieved and so on.

Whereas as regards points of disagreement, which in the final analysis express the contradictions between Soviet and Italian revisionists, the «Communist» review speaks mainly in R. Leda's terms, who is less of a polycentrist and more likely to submit to the Soviet revisionist leadership than to the leadership of the Italian Communist Party which pursues P. Togliati's course for a revisionist «independent», «national», anti-Soviet and polycentrist line.

In the first place, the «Communist» criticises Amendola for his exaggerated «autonomous» tendency to break away from the Soviet revisionist leadership, because he draws the line between «the problems of the revolution in the West and the world revolutionary processes» (read: the revisionist processes of development of the Soviet Union), because he stands on reformist positions of «narrow-nationalism» and does not understand the Soviet revolution

between the two world wars. By posing the question in this way the Soviet revisionists pursue a two-fold objective: on one hand, to check the centrifugal tendencies observed in various revisionist groupings, especially in the leadership of the Italian Communist Party and on the other hand to deal a further blow at the marxist-leninist parties, whom the Khrushchevite revisionists have long slanderously accused of «nationalism» «national narrow-mindedness» and so on.

Secondly, the «Communist» criticises Amendola because he has openly expressed his disapproval for the ousting of arch-revisionist N. Khrushchev, because from this he has drawn the conclusion that the «anti-democratic methods of the cult of the individual» have not yet been liquidated in the Soviet Union, and because he demands a speeding up of the process of «liberalization» in the Soviet Union. Through this the Soviet leadership expresses its dissatisfaction towards the positions of certain revisionist leaders regarding the ouster of the bankrupt and discredited arch-revisionist Khrushchev; through this it tries to hush up reality that it follows Khrushchevism to the letter, though without Khrushchev, that its new «moderated» tactics following Khrushchev's downfall is sheer bluff intending to hoodwink the communists and the working masses both in the Soviet Union and throughout the world.

Thirdly, the «Communist» criticises Amendola because of his «hasty» tactics in all matters, because of his unmasked acts of rejecting leninism and because of his liquidatory extremism, things which discredit modern revisionism as a whole. This is another manifestation of the endeavors to maintain the center of modern revisionism under all conditions in its main lair in Moscow.

In this way the open discussion on Amendola's «Hypotheses» both in the press of the Italian Communist Party press as well as abroad, bears witness of the contradictions existing in the ranks of modern revisionism on an international scale. But at the same time, the Soviet leadership stands on the same grounds with Amendola & C⁰ in regard to the other basic issues, to the line of modern revisionism in general.

As a matter of fact, the line of contact with social-democrats was elaborated in the ill-famed XX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and began to be pursued at large immediately after. As we have pointed out also in an article of the «Zëri i Popullit» daily under the heading «Modern Revisionists on the way to social-democratic degeneracy and to fusion with social-democrats», published on April 7, 1964, this orientation was re-emphasized at the XXI and XXII Congresses and was sanctioned in the new program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Speaking at the XXIIth Congress N. Khrushchev said that contact and union with social-democracy «is no temporary slogan of the communist movement, but a slogan dictated by the fundamental interests of the working class». He has likewise said: «If we speak of the decisive role of non-communist parties, we should above all stress that the collaboration of the communist party with other parties at the present situation of the socialist transformation of society is not only feasible but also indispensable» (N. Khrushchev replying to the editor of the Australian newspaper «Herald», John Ware appearing in «Pravda» one June 25, 1958).

And true enough it is a familiar fact that ever-since that time it was precisely N. Khrushchev who

had a series of «hearty» contacts with the leaders of «the bourgeois parties of the working class» Guy Mollet, Spaak, H. Wilson and quite a number of others, at which as the chiefs of social-democracy have themselves expressed it, «they received satisfactory assurances on many points».

It is significant also that in the article of the «Communist» itself, of which we spoke above, there are certain theses which in essence justify Amendola's position. Among others we read there that «it is understabneable that the communist of Italy should show continous interest in the problem of unity». for «by posing the problem of unity in a realistic manner, the leadership of the Italian Communist Party has not in any way set aside the problem of the creation of a single party and that this is quite natural for a country like Italy where not only workers but the broad laboring masses, the middle class, the intellectuals, the various parties which suggest or accept the socialist perspective, are moving towards socialism». In another place it is even written that joint actions among them make it easier to «achieve a wider agreement on matters of ideology as well». Hence, the «Communist» justifies both the raising of the problem of the single party, the calling of the other non-proletarian parties as pro-socialist as well as the ideological co-existence with them.

But at the same time, feeling that it is standing on unsafe grounds and that it runs the risk of being exposed, the «Communist» cries out in despair unable to give a single argument to prove the contrary: «There is no justification at all for those socialists who try to interpret the discussion of the Italian communists and their attempts to find a more perfect

revolutionary tactics as an approval of the criticism and revision of marxism, as an approval of the interpretation they make of the process of renewing begun by the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which the socialists interpret as a renunciation of Lenin's heritage in order to revert to social-democratic ways of treating problems». «Qui s'excuse, s'accuse»! How well linked up are the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the discussion and acts of the Togliatist revisionists and the positions of social-democracy!

Since the article in the «Communist» was criticised in «Rinascita» the Soviet leaders came out with a new article of a more general character published in the February 4 issue of «Pravda» under the heading: «Communists and the social-democrats». The sum and substance of this article is from top to bottom a preaching and justification for nearing and merging the communists with the social-democrats.

What are the views of the Soviet revisionists expressed in this article which are fully in agreement with those of Amendola and of the other Italian revisionists?

On one hand, social-democracy is totally and openly prettyfied, on the other, the marxist-leninists are put in the shade and the mouldy goods of revisionism are advertised far and wide.

«Pravda» describes social-democracy as a force which «has made a turn to the left», which has allegedly admitted the indispensability of socialism, which has given up «open» anti-communism and anti-sovietism, which is ready for contacts and collaboration with communists, and so on. And to illustrate these theses it refers to the French Social-

ist Party, to the Labour Party in England and so on which, as we know, have demonstrated by fact how anti-communist, how subservient to capital and how aggressive they are both when they have been or are in power, as well as when they have been or are in «opposition». Moreover, «Pravda» links such a «change» with the fact that the communists (read: revisionists) are pursuing with «more persistence» the principle of peaceful coexistence (without principle), the policy of averting a nuclear war (by capitulating to imperialist aggression), the «peaceful way» of transition to socialism etc. Can «Pravda» have rendered better service in this case to the enemies of comunism when it tells them neither more nor less that the communists had allegedly not fought with «persistence» before against nuclear war? Then what were they before the revisionists came to the fore, warmongers? But there is nothing astonishing in this, for we know too well that Khrushchevites called even the leaders of the American aggresive imperialists «peace-lovers» while the true marxist-leninists as warmongers.

In this article «Pravda» writes also openly that the communists (it refers to revisionists) have corrected «their mistakes» eversince the XXth Congress of the communist Party of the Soviet Union which attacked their former «dogmatic» and «sectarian» positions in all directions and concretely they have changed their views (from leninists to revisionists) on social-democracy and do not consider it any longer as an agency of the bourgeoisie; they approve of the «new» ways of peaceful transition to socialism in the advanced capitalist countries, they consider the democratic reforms (in a bourgeois state) as a means to proceed towards socialism in these countries; they

have renounced the leadership of a single party as an essential condition for building socialism and approve of the «system of many parties» including the legal parties of the opposition (that is, they approve and tolerate the counter-revolution and sharing of power) and so on and so forth.

Therefore, it is obvious that it was precisely the Soviet revisionist leaders at the infamous Khrushchevite XXth Congress who formulated clearly the theoretic basis and who preache and apply zealously today contact and fusion with social-democracy, who, for the sake of this contact and of their final counter-revolutionary ends, preach and carry out the course of doing away with communist parties and of abandoning the basic principles of marxism-leninism in toto.

It was the Khrushchevite revisionists who first launched their attacks against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, throwing mud at the whole glorious period when J.V. Stalin was at its head. They forced an altogether opportunist, anti-marxist and anti-socialist line on the great party founded by Lenin. They did away with sound revolutionary cadres and substituted them with all types of career-seeking and revisionist men. Khrushchevites turned the party from a revolutionary political staff of the working class and of the laboring masses into an economic organization, they chopped it up into an «industrial party» an «agricultural party» divesting it of political functions and transformed it into a «party of the belly». Finally, they wiped out its class character of the proletarian communist party and one beautiful day proclaimed it «the party of all the people».

Does it, therefore, not come to sight clearly

enough where Amendola found the inspiration to come out with his «Hypotheses», before the public? Is the organic connection between the idea of the «single party» in capitalist countries and the thesis of «the party of all the people» in the Soviet Union not clearly evident? Both sides are at one that in order to sabotage proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries and in order to restore capitalism in socialist countries it is essential to do away with the revolutionary party of the working class.

This is why it is essential to firmly expose the positions and demagogic maneuvers of the Soviet leaders, the equally revisionist and liquidatory essence of their «criticism» of the revisionist-liquidator Amendola, to expose the fact that not only are their positions essentially the same but that the Khrushchevite revisionists are the teachers and protectors of Amendola and C0.

In order to lead the communists and the people astray the present Soviet leaders are now creating the impression that they are in the process of correcting some of their past blunders. But who are the authors of these blunders? They say nothing of this. It is a known fact that the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union took a special decision and a loudly proclaimed one at that, to reorganize the party on the basis of production and to turn it into «a party of the belly», signifying it as a «turn of historic significance» in the life of the party. These decisions have been arrived at collectively, therefore, the responsibility for them must be shared by all. It is futile for the present Soviet leaders to try to save their skin and throw all the blame on Khrushchev alone.

But the present Soviet leaders may say that N.

Khrushchev forced these measures on them. But then why did they not rise against these measures and condemn them, or were they afraid of the consequences that might evolve on them? Khrushchev too said the same thing in connection with his attacks and slanders against Stalin namely, that they saw the mistakes but could not utter a word. Let us assume, as the revisionists claim, that this used to be so because «democracy was lacking» then. But today, after the XXth Congress which, according to revisionists, inaugurated the epoch of «flourishing democracy, legality and freedom», how can such things happen, how is it possible that one dare not speak, that one be afraid?

The bluffs and demagogy of the revisionists, their attempts to keep the culprits behind closed doors in order to escape responsibility cannot deceive the communists. Today everything becomes clearer and clearer. The true visage of revisionism and of revisionists is now being made plain to even such parties which, under the leaders bâton used to pursue the Khrushchevite revisionist course. They are now raising their voice in protest and demand that revisionism be stripped naked of their mask. Such voices will be heard more and more every day, until, in unison with the firm and principled struggle of the marxist-leninists throughout the world, they will cause new defeats to revisionism and will bring about its final collapse.

Not a casual phenomenon, but an expression of the treacherous aims of the modern revisionists in general

But the liquidatory positions of Amendola, of the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party and of the Khrushchevite revisionists have become the positions of the whole international modern revisionism. Thus, the discussion in the Italian Communist Party on the «single party», Amendola's new traitorous and liquidatory initiative, is not a single and isolated phenomenon. In reality it represents one of the aspects, probably the most typical and clear-cut aspect, of a whole new campaign, recently begun on an international scale by all the modern revisionists for contact, collaboration and fusion with social-democracy. This is made evident by the decisions, resolutions and discussions in various revisionist parties of Western Europe. This is clearly borne out also by the round-table discussions on the problems of «the unity of the workers and democratic movements of the capitalist countries», organized by the international revisionist review called «Problems of Peace and Socialism», discussions which were published in its № 1 and № 2 issues of this year.

What are the views expressed by the revisionists representatives of the communist and workers parties of a number of countries at these discussions?

The tone to these discussions was given in the inaugural speech by P. Entges (the French Communist Party). By distorting the spirit and substance of the 1960 Moscow Declaration and by trying to sell off soap for cheese, he said: «The Declaration creates new conditions and charges us communists with new tasks for unity with socialists and for a

wider union of the democratic forces». What is more he substantiated this by posing the problem in this way: «Can we foresee, not only an agreement on a joint program but also on achieving that organizational unity of which Guy Mollet has said: 'We, socialists, should re-affirm the necessity of re-establishing unity', and can the unity of action which we shall ultimately achieve, be preserved in the peaceful or non-peaceful development of the revolution as well as later when the final victory of the workers will be assured?»

The representative of the Italian Communist Party, L. Gruppi, openly opposes the orientation of the VII Congress of the Comintern regarding the problems of unity, justifies and openly takes under his protection the «social-democrats». «According to my opinion» he says «the fact that the correction of erroneous positions and the exposure of the danger of sectarianism at the VIIth Congress was not accompanied by an open criticism of the mistakes made in the past, weakened the importance and contribution which the VIIth Congress rendered to the development of the strategy of the communist movement». And further: «For thirty years we have said that social-democracy deceives the workers. Whereas we should have made an objective study of the reasons why, at certain situations and at certain moments the majority of the working class have followed social-democracy. Apparently, social-democracy succeeded at these moments to express the demands of the working class, be it even in a mystic and contradictory form, while the communist movement failed to express these demands in the proper way...»

The representative of the Communist Party of

Spain, Alvares, keeping the true visage of social-democracy in the background lays forth the task: «Today, thanks to the development of the world revolutionary process and thanks to the positions that certain socialist parties and social democracy in general occupy under conditions of the success of the democratic and revolutionary forces, our position should become exact». Considering the preservation of the social-democratic parties necessary, he further adds: «The urgent necessity for unity demands of us this. We should not expect that social-democracy be fighting for socialism together with communists if it is faced with the perspective of being liquidated as a political party. Therefore, we should hold out another perspective to social-democracy, the perspective of preserving it as a party during transition to socialism». But since these arguments of Alvare's seem to be at variance with the idea of the unified party which he and other revisionists uphold, he continues: «This demands on one hand, clarity in the matter of the single party of the proletariat and, on the other, the acceptance of many parties in socialism».

I. Lehtinen (Finland) wants to shadow off the revolutionary past and is in favor of consolidating contact with Finnish social-democracy headed by Tenner, an arch-enemy of communism. «Our party» Lehtinen says, «strives to impose relations with the social-democrats. The policy of the united front which the Communist Party of Finland pursues now is much different from the former policy, particularly from that we pursued in the 30's. The slogan of the united front was mainly posed then for the purpose of exposing social-democrat leaders». He emphasizes that in Finland today «there are definite points of

contact betweent the program and aims of the communists and the program and aims of the social-democratic trends».

Whereas from the discussion by U. Keshtan (the Communist Party of Canada) it comes out clear that many communist parties of the West are influenced in this issue by the attitude of the Italian and French Communist Parties. He questions Lenin's assessment and marxist-leninist teachings about social-democracy: «L. Gruppi referred in part to the question whether social-democracy constitutes in fact the main prop of capitalism in the workers movement. As marxist-leninists we have been brought up precisely with this thesis as our starting point. If this thesis is to remain in power then we must draw the conclusion that the tactical stand is one thing, whereas the possibility of social relations (if we are allowed to use this term) with social-democracy in the struggle for socialism is a very different thing altogether». U. Keshtan openly calls for discarding Lenin's assessment of social-democracy as an agency of the bourgeoisie in the workers movement, and makes very explicit that this would be a new step against marxism-leninism, a step which he evaluates as the one to absolutize the peaceful way and other treacherous steps of the modern revisionists. U. Keshtan wants that social democracy should from now on be called «an important trend in the workers movement». «We must settle this matter in the same way we settled the question of peaceful transition, of utilizing the parliament and many other matters».

In his discussion A. Petersen (the Communist Party of Norway) comes out as an open apologizer of social-democracy and of capitalism. He says: «In

Norway social-democracy has been in power for many years. And in the eyes of the working class it was social-democracy and no one else that abolished poverty in the country. According to the opinion of the people it was precisely social-democracy that abolished oppression and assured democratic rights». Having enlarged on the high standard of living in Scandinavian countries Petersen stresses: «Under these conditions it is hard to say that the social-democrats are the enemies of the working people, agents of the bourgeoisie. This is not only hard but foolish. Proceeding from this we have thought of changing our attitude towards social-democracy, and not only towards the plain members of this party but also towards its leaders. We have been compelled to admit that the working class upholds social-democracy and the influence of our party in elections is becoming weaker... It must be avowed that we, ourselves, because of our dogmatic positions, have assisted the bourgeoisie in its propaganda. We got wise to this and tried to draw lessons from this in the program of our party adopted in 1963». With a «self-criticism» of this kind Petersen denies the role of the communist party and comes out as fiery partisan of social-democracy.

After such an open presentation of opportunist and counter-revolutionary views, the representative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, E. Ambartsumov, did not wish to lag behind either, therefore, in his discussion, he backed «the idea expressed during the discussion that in the last two or three years a definite movement to the left has been observed in the ranks of social-democratic parties due to the pressure of the masses». He is also in agreement with «the criticism of certain

aspects of the former policy of the communist movement» towards social-democracy. Ambartsumov says that in efforts for unity among communists there should be «an ideological and political battle, but a battle between allies, not between foes».

This is how the representatives of modern revisionism in different countries have posed the problem of unity. In them there is nothing new or different in essence from what has been expressed in the discussion in the Italian Communist Party or by its most advanced spokesman G. Amendola. Thus, the attempts of the revisionists to degenerate organizationally and to do away with the marxist-leninist party, the main weapon in the hands of the proletariat to carry out the revolution and to build socialism is in the order of the day, emerging from the national framework and becoming an international phenomenon just as the whole of modern revisionism has long become an international phenomenon.

This verifies once again how far the modern revisionists have gone along their way of betrayal. Facts go to prove in an incontestable way that there is no distinction any longer between them and the social-democrats and that in all fields they have come closer to and collaborate not only with them but also with their boss, the world imperialism headed by the USA.

For this reason it becomes today more imperative than ever: to frustrate the plans of the modern revisionists aiming to disarm the working class and to doom it to live or to return to savage capitalist exploitation; to expose the demagogic tactics of the present Soviet leaders who are striving to carry out Khrushchevism in secret without Khrushchev in all

fields, including that of doing away with communist parties. Now there is no place for further illusions.

There is no doubt that marxist-leninist forces in countries or parties where revisionists are in the leadership will not let the workers unarmed and at the mercy of their destiny. On the contrary, new sprouts are bursting forth there, in the ranks of the long suffering proletariat, sprouts of genuine revolutionary parties of the new leninist type. This is an objective and irresistible process, just as objective and irresistible as the certain death of the odious capitalist system and of its offspring — the modern revisionism — and the ultimate triumph of socialism and communism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

— G. Amendola condemns the disunion with the renegates of marxism and of communism and preaches union and fusion with them 6

— «The Italian Way to Socialism» is the social-democratic way for perpetuating capitalism 20

— From revising the fundamental principles of marxism-leninism to abandoning them altogether and to liquidating the communist party 35

— G. Amendola's line is the line of all the revisionist leaders of the Italian Communist Party 47

— Khrushchevite revisionists — sponsors and supporters of the liquidatory course of the Togliatist revisionists 57

— Not a casual phenomenon, but an expression of the treacherous aims of the modern revisionists in general 67